

Spin-1/2 Maxwell Fields

Rollin S. Armour, Jr.

Physics Department, Mercer University, Macon, GA 31207-0001, USA*

(Dated: May 9, 2003; revised March 17, 2004)

Requiring covariance of Maxwell's equations without *a priori* imposing charge invariance allows for both spin-1 and spin-1/2 transformations of the complete Maxwell field and current. The spin-1/2 case yields new transformation rules, with new invariants, for all traditional Maxwell field and source quantities. The accompanying spin-1/2 representations of the Lorentz group employ the Minkowski metric, and consequently the primary spin-1/2 Maxwell invariants are also spin-1 invariants; for example, $\Phi^2 - \mathbf{A}^2$, $\mathbf{E}^2 - \mathbf{B}^2 + 2i\mathbf{E} \cdot \mathbf{B} - (\partial_0\Phi + \nabla \cdot \mathbf{A})^2$. The associated Maxwell Lagrangian density is also the same for both spin-1 and spin-1/2 fields. However, in the spin-1/2 case, standard field and source quantities are complex and both charge and gauge invariance are lost. Requiring the potentials to satisfy the Klein-Gordon equation equates the Maxwell and field-potential equations with two Dirac equations of the Klein-Gordon mass, and thus one complex Klein-Gordon Maxwell field describes either two real vector fields or two Dirac fields, all of the same mass.

PACS numbers: 03.50.De, 03.65.Pm, 12.20.-m, 11.30.Pb

I. INTRODUCTION

The standard Lorentz transformation properties of the Maxwell field derive from more than simply covariance of Maxwell's equations. The usual vector or tensor properties of the field include an additional requirement, generally fixing the transformation rule of the source terms [1, 2]. Traditionally, this requirement is filled by imposing invariance on electric charge [2, 3]. Charge invariance forces the charge density to transform as the top component of a four-vector, leading to the usual transformation properties for the remaining field and source terms [2]. But the additional constraint may take other forms. Among these are explicit covariance of the source-free Maxwell equations (required by Einstein [4]), imposing an invariant gauge-fixing condition $\Gamma = \partial_0\Phi + \nabla \cdot \mathbf{A}$ [5], equating the charge-density current with the Dirac probability-density current [6], and simultaneous charge invariance and covariance of the Lorentz four-force [3]. Each of these requirements in conjunction with Maxwell equation covariance leads to the expected transformation properties of the Maxwell field. However, *a priori* imposing such constraints on Lorentz transformations of Maxwell's equations is a restricted case of the more general requirement of their covariance. In the general case, we may allow the Maxwell variables to transform in any manner leaving the equations as a whole covariant, and then determine the specific transformation properties of the various field and source terms. Our interest here is in the possibility that the general case may allow alternate transform rules for the Maxwell variables.

Indeed, there is some evidence in the literature to support this interest. Previous authors have found that specialized or restricted forms of Maxwell's equations describe spin-1/2 fields [7–18], and in one instance a

four-vector combined electric and magnetic field [16]. Both observations are a result of efforts to describe the Dirac field in electromagnetic (EM) terms [7–26]. Darwin [7] alluded to the first possibility in 1928, not long after the Dirac equation debuted, noting that it was equivalent to a massive form of Maxwell's equations with gradient-constrained electric and magnetic currents $j_{elec}^\alpha = \partial^\alpha f$, $j_{mag}^\alpha = \partial^\alpha h$. A series of authors have since rediscovered similar Maxwell-Dirac equation correlations [9–22], primarily illustrating spin-1/2 Maxwell-like fields, but among these are Darwin-constrained Maxwell equations with multiple transformation properties.

In one such approach, Sallhofer [10–13] describes a direct correspondence between the Dirac equation and the source-free Maxwell equations in a medium of potential- and mass-dependent electromagnetic permittivity and permeability (*a la* Madelung [8]). The correspondence gives 1/2-angle factors to solutions of the source-free Maxwell equations allowing for an electromagnetic-like description of a spin-1/2 matter wave. “Electrodynamic particle fields with half-integer spin are represented ... as a standing [EM] wave with a cancelling counter-wave” [11], rather like a dipole, and thus do not appear electromagnetic from the outside [12]. But the associated Maxwell-Dirac relationship is not Lorentz covariant, leaving unaddressed the question of spin-1/2 transformation properties of the Maxwell field itself.

However, in a Lagrangian study of the Darwin-Maxwell equations, potentials and magnetic current included, Ljolje [9, 22] finds that “The [massless] Dirac equation or equivalent [massless Darwin-Maxwell] equations ... [each] describe two different physical fields: a bispinor field, and a field composed of a second order tensor field and one scalar and one pseudoscalar field” [9]. The associated Lagrangian density is invariant under *both* spin-1 and spin-1/2 (Dirac spinor) transformations in both massless and massive cases. From the Maxwell perspective, the formalism is restricted primarily by the Darwin gradient-constrained sources, but Ljolje gives a thorough account

*Electronic address: armour_r@mercer.edu

of the equivalence of these special-source Maxwell equations and the Dirac equation, illustrating a fermionic Maxwell-like field. Several related investigations also describe spin-1/2, or Darwin-based, Maxwell-like fields (see especially Papini [17]) [18–21], while many others have explored similar Dirac- or fermion-like Maxwell equations [1, 27–67], a number of which we will refer to in progress below [27, 68].

Simulik and Krivsky [14–16] have since solved the Lorentz covariance problem of the Sallhofer model by including these same gradient-constrained electric and magnetic currents, yielding the massless Darwin and Dirac equations. Mass appears as a property of the EM medium, as before. Called the “maximally symmetric” Maxwell equations, a real Maxwell field is written with four complex components $(\mathbf{E} - i\mathbf{B}, f - ih) \equiv \psi_{MS}$, the gradient of the fourth returns the electric and magnetic currents, giving the Darwin sources (no potentials included). In the massless case, the authors have explicitly demonstrated covariance of this form of Maxwell’s equations while ψ_{MS} transforms under the Dirac representation of the Lorentz group $(1/2, 0) \oplus (0, 1/2)$, the expected tensor-scalar representation $(1, 0) \oplus (0, 0)$ [16], and the vector representation $(1/2, 1/2)$.¹ In fact, though unmentioned by the authors, this specialized form of Maxwell’s equations, like their equivalent massless Dirac equation, transforms covariantly under *any* four-dimensional representation of the Lorentz group (see beginning of Sec. III below). However, the significance of its specialized sources is not clear (see Gersten, Refs. [14, 33]), obscuring comparison with the standard Maxwell field.

The importance of the above investigations for our purposes is not in their electromagnetic-like descriptions of the Dirac field, which invariably require a constrained form of Maxwell’s equations [66], but in their demonstration of Maxwell-like fields with spin-1/2 transformation properties. Here, we will find that a more significant spin-1/2 Lorentz transformation property is characteristic of the *complete Maxwell field without constraints*.

We begin by revisiting the Maxwell and field-potential equations in a familiar matrix form, obtained by factoring a simple 4-d wave equation. We then readdress the now century-old problem of Maxwell-equation covariance [4, 69], allowing charge, the gauge-fixing condition, and charge-density current to transform without additional requirements. Covariance of Maxwell’s equations then naturally returns *two* transformation rules for the full

Maxwell field, the expected spin-1 rule and a new spin-1/2 transformation of all Maxwell variables.

The resulting spin-1/2 Maxwell field differs significantly from its previously known vector and spinor forms. First, it is the complete field and current, not a restricted or partial form. Second, its spin-1/2 transformation employs the $(1/2, 0) \oplus (1/2, 0)$ and its conjugate $(0, 1/2) \oplus (0, 1/2)$ representations of the Lorentz group, *not* the Dirac representation, the first transforming the potentials and sources, and the second the fields. Surprisingly, the natural basis for these two representations is *Minkowskian*, with group elements R satisfying the orthogonality condition $R^T g R = g$ where g is the *Minkowski* metric. That is, the Minkowski metric accompanies the Maxwell invariance relations under both spin-1 and *spin-1/2* transformations, serving as both four-vector and *four-spinor* metrics. As a result, the primary spin-1/2 Maxwell invariants are also spin-1 invariants, e.g., $\Phi^2 - \mathbf{A}^2, \mathbf{B}^2 - 2i\mathbf{E} \cdot \mathbf{B} - \mathbf{E}^2 + (\partial_0 \Phi + \nabla \cdot \mathbf{A})^2$. However, spin-1/2 field and source terms are generally complex and neither charge nor the four-divergence of the potentials remain invariant. Separating these terms into real and imaginary parts gives standard real electric and magnetic charge-density currents and a corresponding real Maxwell field in all frames. Third, like the field equations themselves, the Lagrangian densities for the spin-1/2 and spin-1 Maxwell fields are *identical*. That is, the Lagrangian density for the complete Maxwell equations in the matrix form employed here is a scalar under *both spin-1 and spin-1/2* transformations of the Maxwell variables. Introducing a Proca mass term in the Lagrangian density returns the Proca-Maxwell equations which are *also* covariant under both spin-1 and spin-1/2 Lorentz transformations.

Finally, the correspondence between the Maxwell and Dirac equations takes a natural form, similar to that of Ljölje [9]. Requiring the EM potentials to satisfy the Klein-Gordon equation, as if to describe a massive vector boson, equates the Maxwell and field-potential equations with two Dirac equations of identical mass. The resulting Maxwell-Dirac equation correspondence is thus one-to-two; or equivalently, one complex Klein-Gordon Maxwell field can be understood as either two real vector fields or two complex Dirac fields.

Our work is arranged as follows: Sec. II, Matrix Maxwell Equations; III, Spin-1/2 and Spin-1 Transformations of the Maxwell Variables; IV, The Minkowski Spinor; V, Spin-1/2 Electromagnetic Invariants; VI, Dual Spin-1/2–Spin-1 Maxwell and Proca Lagrangian Densities; VII, Loss of Gauge Invariance, Charge Invariance, and the Lorentz Four-Force in the Spin-1/2 Case; VIII, Equivalence of the Klein-Gordon Maxwell and Two Dirac Equations; IX, Conclusion; Appendices, A: Covariance of Maxwell’s Equations; B: Index Notation; C: Spin-1/2 and Spin-1 Minkowski-Basis Eigenvectors.

¹ In a separate approach, Esposito [46] and T. Ivezic [*Found. Phys.* **33**, 1339 (2003) (hep-th/0302188); physics/0311043; and references therein] define “auxiliary” electric and magnetic four-vectors from the electromagnetic field tensor, its dual, and the four-velocity, $E^\alpha = F^{\alpha\beta} v_\beta / c$ and $B^\alpha = \tilde{F}^{\alpha\beta} v_\beta / c$. This leads to manifestly-covariant, though non-Maxwellian, definitions of electric and magnetic fields. But the transformation properties of the field tensors, whose elements are the standard electric and magnetic field components, are unchanged. Hence this formalism redescribes the traditional tensor Maxwell field.

II. THE MATRIX MAXWELL EQUATIONS

Expanding on the work of Moses [39–41], we begin with²

$$\partial_\alpha \partial^\alpha \mathbf{A} = \mathbf{Y} \quad (1)$$

and factor the d'Alembertian operator via

$$\partial_\alpha \partial^\alpha \mathbf{A} = (\mu^\alpha \partial^\alpha)(\mu^\beta \partial_\beta) \mathbf{A} = \mathbf{Y}. \quad (2)$$

Equation (2) separates into two first-order equations

$$\mu^\alpha \partial^\alpha \mathbf{A} = \mathbf{C} \quad (3a)$$

$$\mu^\beta \partial_\beta \mathbf{C} = \mathbf{Y}, \quad (3b)$$

where $\mathbf{A}$, $\mathbf{C}$, and $\mathbf{Y}$ remain to be interpreted. The matrices μ^α must satisfy $(\mu^\alpha)^2 = \mathbf{1}$, $\mu^0 \mu^j = \mu^j \mu^0$, $\mu^j \mu^k = -\mu^k \mu^j$, $j, k, l = 1-3$. To allow for the possibility that $\mathbf{A}$ may transform as a four-vector, we ask that it have four components. A convenient hermitian representation for the μ^α is then [39–41]

$$\mu^0 = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix} = \mathbf{1}, \quad \mu^1 = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & -1 & 0 & 0 \\ -1 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & -i \\ 0 & 0 & i & 0 \end{pmatrix}, \quad (4)$$

$$\mu^2 = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 & -1 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & i \\ -1 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & -i & 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix}, \quad \mu^3 = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 & 0 & -1 \\ 0 & 0 & -i & 0 \\ 0 & i & 0 & 0 \\ -1 & 0 & 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix}.$$

The μ^j of (4) relate to the vector rotation and boost generators³ $\mathcal{J}^j$ and $\mathcal{K}^j$ via $\mu^j = -\mu_j = \mathcal{J}^j - i\mathcal{K}^j$ and satisfy $\det \mu^j = 1$, $\text{tr} \mu^j = 0$, $\mu^j \mu^k = i\varepsilon_{jkl} \mu^l + \delta_{jk} \mathbf{1}$, $j, k, l = 1-3$. They may be reduced to a block-diagonal composition of the Pauli matrices⁴ σ^j by applying the unitary transformation ($U^{-1} = U^\dagger$)

$$U \equiv \frac{1}{2} \begin{pmatrix} 1 & -1 & i & -1 \\ 1 & -1 & -i & 1 \\ i & i & 1 & -i \\ -i & -i & 1 & -i \end{pmatrix}, \quad \Sigma^j \equiv U \mu^j U^\dagger = \begin{pmatrix} \sigma^j & 0 \\ 0 & \sigma^j \end{pmatrix}, \quad (5)$$

$j = 1, 2, 3$. We will refer to Eqs. (4) and (5) as the R mer matrices in the *Minkowski* and *Pauli* bases respectively.

In the Minkowski basis, we identify

$$\mathbf{A} = \begin{pmatrix} \Phi \\ A_x \\ A_y \\ A_z \end{pmatrix}, \quad \mathbf{C} = \begin{pmatrix} \Gamma \\ C_x \\ C_y \\ C_z \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} \Gamma \\ -E_x - iB_x \\ -E_y - iB_y \\ -E_z - iB_z \end{pmatrix}, \quad (6)$$

$$\mathbf{Y} = \begin{pmatrix} \Upsilon \\ Y_x \\ Y_y \\ Y_z \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} \rho + \partial_0 \Gamma \\ J_x - \partial_x \Gamma \\ J_y - \partial_y \Gamma \\ J_z - \partial_z \Gamma \end{pmatrix}.$$

For $\mathbf{A}$ real, employing (4) to write out (3a) and (3b) yields the gauge-fixing and field-potential (Gauss-Kirchhoff) relations (3a) [70] and Maxwell's equations (3b) respectively⁵

$$\left. \begin{aligned} \partial_0 \Phi + \nabla \cdot \mathbf{A} &= \Gamma, \\ \nabla \times \mathbf{A} &= \mathbf{B}, \quad -\nabla \Phi - \partial_0 \mathbf{A} = \mathbf{E}, \end{aligned} \right\} \quad (7a)$$

$$\left. \begin{aligned} \nabla \cdot \mathbf{E} &= \rho, \quad \nabla \times \mathbf{B} - \partial_0 \mathbf{E} = \mathbf{J}, \\ \nabla \cdot \mathbf{B} &= 0, \quad \nabla \times \mathbf{E} + \partial_0 \mathbf{B} = 0. \end{aligned} \right\} \quad (7b)$$

For $\mathbf{A}$ complex, the situation is slightly more involved. We may independently define $\mathbf{B} \equiv \nabla \times \mathbf{A}$ and $\mathbf{E} \equiv -\nabla \Phi - \partial_0 \mathbf{A}$, under which Eqs. (7) remain valid as they are. $\mathbf{E}$ and $\mathbf{B}$ are then also complex and no longer the real and imaginary parts of $\mathbf{C}$ [71]. However, for complex $\mathbf{A}$, let us define alternate electric and magnetic fields as the real and imaginary parts of $\mathbf{C}$ and equate real and imaginary parts of Eqs. (3). In shorthand notation, let

$$\begin{aligned} \begin{pmatrix} \Phi \\ \mathbf{A} \end{pmatrix} &= \begin{pmatrix} \phi + i\theta \\ \mathbf{a} + i\mathbf{b} \end{pmatrix}, \quad \begin{pmatrix} \Gamma \\ \mathbf{C} \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} \gamma + i\delta \\ -\boldsymbol{\varepsilon} - i\boldsymbol{\mathcal{B}} \end{pmatrix}, \\ \begin{pmatrix} \rho \\ \mathbf{J} \end{pmatrix} &= \begin{pmatrix} \epsilon + i\beta \\ \mathbf{j} + i\mathbf{m} \end{pmatrix}, \end{aligned} \quad (8)$$

where $\phi, \theta, \mathbf{a}, \mathbf{b}, \gamma, \delta, \boldsymbol{\varepsilon}, \boldsymbol{\mathcal{B}}, \epsilon, \beta, \mathbf{j}, \mathbf{m}$ are real. Equations (3a) and (3b) respectively then become

$$\left. \begin{aligned} \partial_0 \phi + \nabla \cdot \mathbf{a} &= \gamma, \quad \partial_0 \theta + \nabla \cdot \mathbf{b} = \delta, \\ \nabla \times \mathbf{a} - \nabla \theta - \partial_0 \mathbf{b} &= \boldsymbol{\mathcal{B}}, \\ -\nabla \times \mathbf{b} - \nabla \phi - \partial_0 \mathbf{a} &= \boldsymbol{\varepsilon}, \end{aligned} \right\} \quad (9a)$$

$$\left. \begin{aligned} \nabla \cdot \boldsymbol{\varepsilon} &= \epsilon, \quad \nabla \times \boldsymbol{\mathcal{B}} - \partial_0 \boldsymbol{\varepsilon} = \mathbf{j}, \\ \nabla \cdot \boldsymbol{\mathcal{B}} &= \beta, \quad \nabla \times \boldsymbol{\varepsilon} + \partial_0 \boldsymbol{\mathcal{B}} = -\mathbf{m}. \end{aligned} \right\} \quad (9b)$$

This is the *standard magnetic charge-density current* form of Maxwell's equations [72–74]. As usual, if the ratio of electric to magnetic charge is the same for all sources, this form may be returned to the electric-source-only Maxwell equations (7) by a duality transformation

² Greek indices are 0-3, $x^0 = ct$, $c = 1$, $\text{tr}(g_{\alpha\beta}) = -2$.

³ $(\mathcal{J}^j)^k_l = -i\varepsilon_{jkl}$, all other $(\mathcal{J}^j)^{\alpha\beta} = 0$. $(\mathcal{K}^j)^0_j = -i = (\mathcal{K}^j)^j_0$, all other $(\mathcal{K}^j)^{\alpha\beta} = 0$, see L. H. Ryder, *Quantum Field Theory* (Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 1996), p. 37; Ref. [79].

⁴ $\sigma^0 = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix}$, $\sigma^1 = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 1 \\ 1 & 0 \end{pmatrix}$, $\sigma^2 = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & -i \\ i & 0 \end{pmatrix}$, $\sigma^3 = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ 0 & -1 \end{pmatrix}$.

⁵ Bold Roman fonts indicate the ‘‘spatial’’ (1-3) portions of a given quantity, e.g., $\mathbf{A} = (A_x, A_y, A_z)$, however, these *need not transform* as either a three-vector or as the spatial portions of a four-vector, as we will see below.

[73]. Duality transformations here are simply phase rotations, $e^{i\lambda}$ applied to $\mathbf{A}$, $\mathbf{C}$, and $\mathbf{Y}$. Thus, if a phase angle λ exists such that ρ and $\mathbf{J}$, or equivalently Φ and $\mathbf{A}$, can be made real, then Eqs. (9) are the traditional Maxwell equations (7) under phase rotation.

Operating on (3b) with $\mu^\alpha \partial^\alpha$ yields the charge conservation and electromagnetic wave equations

$$\partial_0 \rho + \nabla \cdot \mathbf{J} = 0, \quad (10a)$$

$$\partial^\alpha \partial_\alpha (\mathbf{E} + i\mathbf{B}) = \nabla \rho + \partial_0 \mathbf{J} - i\nabla \times \mathbf{J} \quad (10b)$$

for ρ , $\mathbf{J}$, $\mathbf{E}$, and $\mathbf{B}$ real or complex.

From here forward, we assume Eqs. (3) are in four-dimensional form and take these to be our fundamental expression of the Maxwell, Gauss-Kirchhoff, and gauge-fixing equations [75].

III. SPIN-1/2 AND SPIN-1 TRANSFORMATIONS OF THE MAXWELL VARIABLES

$\mathbf{A}$ and $\mathbf{Y}$ may transform together under any four-dimensional representation of the Lorentz group and leave Eq. (1) alone covariant. But restricting our attention to (1) comes at the expense of identifying and transforming the field equations proper (3b). Similarly, setting $\mathbf{Y} = 0$ (gradient-constrained sources) allows $\mathbf{C}$ to transform under any four-dimensional representation of the Lorentz group and leave Eq. (3b) alone covariant. The constrained-source equations of Simulik and Krivsky [14–16], and the massless equations of Darwin [7], Madelung [8], Ljolje [9], and Bruce [18], correspond to writing (3b) by itself under this $\mathbf{Y} = 0$ condition (in a Dirac matrix form) and treating $\mathbf{C}$ as a Dirac spinor. Requiring $\Gamma = 0$ in all frames returns Moses's Maxwell equations [39–41], forces the Lorentz gauge, and equates $\mathbf{Y}$ with the current ($\rho, \mathbf{J}$), guaranteeing that the Maxwell variables will transform under their usual spin-1 rules [39]. With both $\mathbf{Y} = 0$ and $\Gamma = 0$ in all frames (i.e., the Lorentz gauge and no sources), Eq. (3b) alone reduces to Maxwell's equations in a photon wave-equation form, again spin-1, often pared to a 3×3 equation only (see [27] and [71]). But to find their general Lorentz transformation properties, we will impose covariance on Eqs. (3) *without* restrictions on $\mathbf{A}$, $\mathbf{C}$ and $\mathbf{Y}$.

Transforming coordinates as usual between frames K and K' via $x'^\beta = \ell^\beta_\alpha x^\alpha$ [76], with $g_{\alpha\beta} dx^\alpha dx^\beta = dx_\beta dx^\beta$ and thus $\ell^\beta_\sigma \ell^\sigma_\alpha = \delta^\alpha_\sigma$, we require in K'

$$\mu'^\alpha \partial'^\alpha A'(x') = C'(x') \quad (11a)$$

$$\mu'^\beta \partial'_\beta C'(x') = Y'(x'), \quad (11b)$$

where we take $\mu'^\alpha = \mu^\alpha$. From (1), $\mathbf{A}$ and $\mathbf{Y}$ must transform under the same rule, so we seek transformation matrices $\mathcal{R}$ and $\mathcal{S}$ satisfying

$$\begin{aligned} A'(x') &= \mathcal{R}(\ell) A(x), & Y'(x') &= \mathcal{R}(\ell) Y(x), \\ C'(x') &= \mathcal{S}(\ell) C(x). \end{aligned} \quad (12)$$

As we show in Appendix A, Eqs. (11) and (12) have two solutions for $\mathcal{R}$ and $\mathcal{S}$. The first is

$$\mathcal{R}(\varphi, \zeta) = \exp \left[i(\varphi + i\zeta) \cdot \frac{\boldsymbol{\mu}}{2} \right] \equiv R(\varphi, \zeta) \quad (13a)$$

$$\mathcal{S}(\varphi, \zeta) = \exp \left[i(\varphi - i\zeta) \cdot \frac{\boldsymbol{\mu}}{2} \right] \equiv S(\varphi, \zeta), \quad (13b)$$

and the second

$$\mathcal{R}(\varphi, \zeta) = \exp[i(\varphi \cdot \boldsymbol{\mathcal{J}} + \zeta \cdot \boldsymbol{\mathcal{K}})] \quad (14a)$$

$$= R(\varphi, \zeta) R^*(\varphi, \zeta) \equiv L(\varphi, \zeta),$$

$$\mathcal{S}(\varphi, \zeta) = \exp[i(\varphi - i\zeta) \cdot \boldsymbol{\mathcal{J}}] \quad (14b)$$

$$= S(\varphi, \zeta) R^*(\varphi, \zeta) \equiv M(\varphi, \zeta)$$

(* = complex conjugate), where φ and ζ are the usual rotation and boost parameters respectively. Note that covariance of Maxwell's equations (3b) alone, or similarly (3a) alone, also leads to solutions (13) and (14) for $\mathcal{R}$ and $\mathcal{S}$. We provide the *improper* transformations of $\mathbf{A}$, $\mathbf{C}$, and $\mathbf{Y}$ at the end of Appendix A.

$\boldsymbol{\mathcal{J}}$ and $\boldsymbol{\mathcal{K}}$ of (14) are the vector rotation and boost generators composing matrices (4), and thus L corresponds to the $(1/2, 1/2)$ representation of the Lorentz group ($L = [\ell^\alpha_\beta]$) and M the scalar-tensor $(0, 0) \oplus (0, 1)$ representation [76]. Equations (14) together thus return the expected spin-1 transformation of the Maxwell variables.

To understand the transformation (13), consider the μ^j in the Pauli basis, as the Σ^j of Eq. (5). We will mark objects in this basis with a dot underneath. Applying the unitary transformation (5), R and S become

$$\dot{R}(\varphi, \zeta) = \exp \left[i(\varphi + i\zeta) \cdot \frac{\boldsymbol{\Sigma}}{2} \right] \quad (\text{under-dot} = \text{Pauli basis})$$

$$\dot{S}(\varphi, \zeta) = \exp \left[i(\varphi - i\zeta) \cdot \frac{\boldsymbol{\Sigma}}{2} \right] = \dot{R}^{-1\dagger}(\varphi, \zeta), \quad (15)$$

and thus the top two and bottom two components of $\dot{\mathbf{A}} = U\mathbf{A}$ and $\dot{\mathbf{Y}} = U\mathbf{Y}$ transform separately as $(1/2, 0)$ two-spinors, while those of $\dot{\mathbf{C}} = U\mathbf{C}$ transform as $(0, 1/2)$ two-spinors [76]. R and $\dot{R}$ are thus equivalent members of the $(1/2, 0) \oplus (1/2, 0)$ representation of the Lorentz group, while S and $\dot{S}$ belong to their conjugate $(0, 1/2) \oplus (0, 1/2)$ representation. R and S thus perform a spin-1/2 transformation of $\mathbf{A}$, $\mathbf{C}$, and $\mathbf{Y}$ and consequently of the Maxwell field and current. (See Appendix A.)

Since R and S are complex, even if the spin-1/2 $\mathbf{A}$, $\mathbf{E}$, $\mathbf{B}$, ρ , and $\mathbf{J}$ are real in one frame, or a duality transformation will eliminate their imaginary parts in that frame, they will remain complex in other frames. Interpreting spin-1/2 field and source terms as real quantities in all frames therefore requires the Dirac magnetic current form of Maxwell's equations (9).

IV. THE MINKOWSKI SPINOR

Before examining the spin-1/2 Maxwell invariants, we require a brief investigation of the properties of R and

TABLE I: Index notation for vector-like representations of the Lorentz group, $R^T g R = S^T g S = L^T g L = M^T g M = g$.

Lorentz Group Representation	Group Element	Alphabetic Index	Numeric Index
$(1/2, 0) \oplus (1/2, 0)$	R ($\bar{R}$)	$a, b, c, \dots$	$0, 1, 2, 3$
$(0, 1/2) \oplus (0, 1/2)$	S ($\bar{S}$), R^* ($\bar{R}^*$)	$\dot{a}, \dot{b}, \dot{c}, \dots$	$\dot{0}, \dot{1}, \dot{2}, \dot{3}$
$(1/2, 1/2)$	L ($\bar{L}$)	$\alpha, \beta, \gamma, \dots$	$0, 1, 2, 3$
$(0, 0) \oplus (0, 1)$	M ($\bar{M}$)	$\hat{\alpha}, \hat{\beta}, \hat{\gamma}, \dots$	$\hat{0}, \hat{1}, \hat{2}, \hat{3}$
Undefined transformation properties	—	$\tilde{\alpha}, \tilde{\beta}, \tilde{\gamma}, \dots$	$\tilde{0}, \tilde{1}, \tilde{2}, \tilde{3}$

S . For representations of the Lorentz group over a complex domain, two types of invariant norms may result [77, 78]. The first involves a vector and its complex conjugate and the second the simple inner product without complex conjugation. The first implies $R^\dagger \kappa R = \kappa$, where κ is the metric. But as in the $(1/2, 0)$ representation, κ has no nonzero solution for $R \in (1/2, 0) \oplus (1/2, 0)$ [nor for $S \in (0, 1/2) \oplus (0, 1/2)$].⁶ We thus look for a norm-squared of the second type and therefore a solution to $R^T \kappa R = \kappa$.

In the Pauli basis, such complex norms-squared may be formed by dotting each top and bottom two-spinor with itself, or each with the other, using the two-spinor metric σ^2 . However, taking our spinor components to be classical commuting functions, as opposed to Grassmann variables, only dotting top and bottom two-spinors with each other will return a nonzero squared-magnitude. Let $Z = \text{col}(\chi, \xi)$ represent a classical 4-spinor transforming via R , with χ and ξ its top and bottom two-spinor segments respectively. In general, a nonzero complex norm-squared results from the metric

$$g \equiv \begin{pmatrix} 0 & -\sigma^2 \\ \sigma^2 & 0 \end{pmatrix} \quad (16)$$

and inner product

$$Z^T g Z = \xi^T \sigma^2 \chi - \chi^T \sigma^2 \xi = 2\xi^T \sigma^2 \chi \quad (17)$$

(similarly for $\bar{S}$). In fact, $(1/2, 0) \oplus (1/2, 0)$ and $(0, 1/2) \oplus (0, 1/2)$ are the only spin-1/2 representations of the Lorentz group for which 4-spinor squared-magnitudes of the type $\psi^T \kappa \psi$, for ψ classical, may be nonzero. This is because the only other 4-spinor representations are $(1/2, 0) \oplus (0, 1/2)$ and its conjugate, both of which form such contractions by dotting each top and bottom two-spinor with itself, e.g. $\psi^T \Sigma^2 \psi$, which is zero for classical ψ . Instead, the only nonzero classical Dirac spinor norm-squared is of the first type, $\psi^\dagger \gamma^0 \psi$.⁷ However, with anticommuting Grassmann components, $Z^T g Z = 0$ while

$Z^T \Sigma^2 Z$, $\psi^T \Sigma^2 \psi$, and $\psi^\dagger \gamma^0 \psi$ are nonzero. R and S with the metric g thus describe 4-spinors with commuting variables and simple norms-squared. They are the lowest dimensional representations of the Lorentz group with nonzero spinor norms of this type.

The metric (16) has a further remarkable property. In the Minkowski basis, g is the *Minkowski metric*

$$g = U^T g U = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & -1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & -1 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & -1 \end{pmatrix}. \quad (18)$$

The invariant (17) thus takes the *vector-like* form $Z^T g Z = Z^T g Z$. We can obtain the same result from the Minkowski basis directly. Letting $i(\varphi + i\zeta) \cdot \mu/2 \equiv \pi$, we have [79]

$$g R^T g = e^{g\pi^T g}, \quad (19)$$

and employing the relation $g\mu^{jT}g = -\mu^j$, $j = 1, 2, 3$, we find $g\pi^T g = -\pi$ and thus

$$R^T g R = g. \quad (20)$$

Similarly $S^T g S = g = M^T g M = L^T g L$, or equivalently

$$\bar{R}^T g \bar{R} = \bar{S}^T g \bar{S} = \bar{M}^T g \bar{M} = \bar{L}^T g \bar{L} = g. \quad (21)$$

Invariant inner products formed in the $(1/2, 0) \oplus (1/2, 0)$ or $(0, 1/2) \oplus (0, 1/2)$ representations of the Lorentz group, like those of $(1/2, 1/2)$, $(0, 0) \oplus (0, 1)$ and its conjugate [80], thus take the Minkowski form

$$X^T g Z = \bar{X}^T g \bar{Z}, \quad (22)$$

where X and Z , or $\bar{X} = UX$ and $\bar{Z} = UZ$, transform together under any one of these representations.

Accordingly, we introduce new notation for *vector-like* representations of the Lorentz group, *those which form invariants with the Minkowski metric*. Let X be a column vector transforming via any Lorentz group representation V satisfying $V^T g V = g$. Thus V may belong to any one of the representations $(1/2, 0) \oplus (1/2, 0)$, $(0, 1/2) \oplus (0, 1/2)$, $(1/2, 1/2)$, $(0, 0) \oplus (0, 1)$, or $(0, 0) \oplus (1, 0)$, designated here by R, S, R^*, L, M, M^* respectively [81]. Now define the Riemannian conjugate

$$\bar{X} \equiv (gX)^T = X^T g. \quad (23)$$

⁶ From Appendix A, considering small rotations and boosts separately, $\mathcal{R}_R^\dagger \kappa \mathcal{R}_R = \kappa$ implies $\kappa \mu^j = \mu^j \kappa$, while $\mathcal{R}_B^\dagger \kappa \mathcal{R}_B = \kappa$ implies $\kappa \mu^j = -\mu^j \kappa$, hence $\kappa = 0$.

⁷ Equations (47) below.

$\bar{X}$ is thus a four-component row of the covariant components of X . This notation does not distinguish between vector-like Lorentz group representations V . To distinguish between these representations we will employ index notation using alphabetic and numeric indices with different fonts, each indicating a separate representation of the Lorentz group. Our index notation is summarized in Table I and further described in Appendix B.

A four-component spinor Z transforming via R , with components Z^a , $a = 0-3$, and its covariant counterpart gZ , transforming via $(R^T)^{-1}$, with components $Z_a = g_{ab}Z^b$ ($g_{ab} = g_{\alpha\beta}$), satisfy

$$Z'^a = R^a_b Z^b, \quad Z'_a = R_a^b Z_b, \\ \bar{Z}'Z' = Z'^a Z'_a = R^a_b R_a^c Z^b Z_c = Z^b Z_b = \bar{Z}Z, \quad (24)$$

where $R^a_b R_a^c = \delta_b^c$ ($= 1$ for $b = c$, 0 for $b \neq c$). Z^* , with components $Z^{a*} \equiv Z^{\dot{a}}$ (a -dot), transforms via R^* . Its covariant counterpart gZ^* , with components $Z_{\dot{a}} = g_{\dot{a}\dot{b}}Z^{\dot{b}}$ [$g_{\dot{a}\dot{b}} \equiv g_{ab}^* = g_{ab}$], thus transforms via $S = (R^\dagger)^{-1}$ [see (A10)]. That is

$$gZ'^* = (R^\dagger)^{-1}(gZ^*) = S(gZ^*), \\ \text{with} \quad Z'^{\dot{a}} = R^{\dot{a}}_{\dot{b}} Z^{\dot{b}} \quad \text{and} \quad Z'_{\dot{a}} = R_{\dot{a}}^{\dot{b}} Z_{\dot{b}} \quad (25)$$

$[R^{\dot{a}}_{\dot{b}} = (R^a_b)^*]$, and thus

$$\bar{Z}'^* Z'^* = Z'^{\dot{a}} Z'_{\dot{a}} = R^{\dot{a}}_{\dot{b}} R_{\dot{a}}^{\dot{c}} Z^{\dot{b}} Z_{\dot{c}} = Z^{\dot{b}} Z_{\dot{b}} = \bar{Z}^* Z^*, \quad (26)$$

where $R^{\dot{a}}_{\dot{b}} R_{\dot{a}}^{\dot{c}} = \delta_{\dot{b}}^{\dot{c}}$ ($= \delta_b^c$) [82]. We will refer to four-component objects transforming under the $(1/2, 0) \oplus (1/2, 0)$ and $(0, 1/2) \oplus (0, 1/2)$ representations of the Lorentz group as *Minkowski spinors*, or as simply *four-spinors*, due to their use of the Minkowski metric and direct analogy with four-vectors.

V. SPIN-1/2 MAXWELL INVARIANTS

Under spin-1/2 transformation, A and Y have contravariant Minkowski spinor components $A^a = (\Phi, \mathbf{A})$ and $Y^a = (\Upsilon, \mathbf{Y})$, while those of C are covariant components of a $(0, 1/2) \oplus (0, 1/2)$ Minkowski spinor and thus designated $C_{\dot{a}} = (C_{\dot{0}}, C_{\dot{1}}, C_{\dot{2}}, C_{\dot{3}}) = (\Gamma, C_x, C_y, C_z)$. We may now form the primary invariant inner products of A , C , and Y in the spin-1/2 case. They are

$$A^a A_a = \bar{A}A = \Phi^2 - \mathbf{A}^2, \quad (27a)$$

$$C^{\dot{a}} C_{\dot{a}} = \bar{C}C = \Gamma^2 - \mathbf{E}^2 + \mathbf{B}^2 - 2i\mathbf{E} \cdot \mathbf{B}, \quad (27b)$$

$$Y^a Y_a = \bar{Y}Y = (\rho + \partial_0 \Gamma)^2 - (\mathbf{J} - \nabla \Gamma)^2, \quad (27c)$$

$$A^a Y_a = \bar{A}Y = \Phi(\rho + \partial_0 \Gamma) - \mathbf{A} \cdot (\mathbf{J} - \nabla \Gamma). \quad (27d)$$

Clearly, each of these inner products is also an invariant of the spin-1 Maxwell field. That is, $\bar{A}A$, $\bar{C}C$, $\bar{Y}Y$, and $\bar{A}Y$ are each invariant under both spin-1 and spin-1/2 transformations of the Maxwell field and current.

If we include the complex conjugates of A , C , and Y , then any contravariant-covariant combination, summed over like indices $a = 0-3$ or $\dot{a} = \dot{0}-\dot{3}$, will also be invariant. For example

$$A^{\dot{a}} C_{\dot{a}} = A^\dagger C = \Phi^* \Gamma - \mathbf{A}^* \cdot (\mathbf{E} + i\mathbf{B}), \quad (28a)$$

$$Y^{\dot{a}} C_{\dot{a}} = Y^\dagger C = \Upsilon^* \Gamma - \mathbf{Y}^* \cdot (\mathbf{E} + i\mathbf{B}), \quad (28b)$$

$$C^a A_a = C^\dagger A = (A^{\dot{a}} C_{\dot{a}})^*, \quad (28c)$$

$$C^a Y_a = C^\dagger Y = (Y^{\dot{a}} C_{\dot{a}})^* \quad (28d)$$

are all spin-1/2 Maxwell invariants. However, these have no spin-1 counterparts stemming from the fact that $S = R^{-1\dagger}$ does not hold for L and M of Eqs. (14).

Finally, we may construct four-vectors and quadri-vectors $[(0, 0) \oplus (0, 1)]$ out of Minkowski spinors. For example, the spin-1/2 A , C , and Y combine to form contravariant four-vectors $A^\dagger \mu_\alpha A$, $C^\dagger \mu^\alpha C$, $Y^\dagger \mu_\alpha Y$, $A^\dagger \mu_\alpha Y$, and quadri-vectors $A^\dagger \mu_\alpha C$ and $Y^\dagger \mu_\alpha C$, with similar results for any like-transforming four-spinors.

VI. DUAL SPIN-1/2-SPIN-1 MAXWELL AND PROCA LAGRANGIAN DENSITIES

A Lagrangian density for Maxwell equations similar to our (3b) has eluded previous attempts at its discovery [33, 49, 83]. Giannetto [45] has written a simple Lagrangian density equivalent to describing (3b) alone without sources and under the Lorentz condition ($Y = \Gamma = 0$). In a related six-component formalism, Drummond [55] has discussed a duality-invariant Lagrangian density for the source-free Maxwell field, as have Abreu and Hott [50, 53]. Sources included, Gersten [33, 83] has described “pseudo-Lagrangians” for Maxwell wave equations similar to (3b), while Ljolje [9] provides an extensive Lagrangian description of the constrained-source Maxwell equations of Darwin, derived from a dual spin-1-spin-1/2 (Dirac spinor) Lagrangian density. (See also [1] and [16].) But in related four-component and similar three-component matrix forms of Maxwell’s equations proper, *with* sources, to quote Jena *et al.* [49], “In neither of these two approaches do the equations seem to follow from an Euler-Lagrange variational principle.”

The problem is finding an appropriate Lagrangian density for equations like (3b) alone. By itself, (3b) and its hermitian conjugate result from varying $C^\dagger$ and C in the Lagrangian density

$$\mathcal{L}_C = \gamma_C [C^\dagger \mu_\alpha \partial^\alpha C - 2C^\dagger Y - (\partial^\alpha C^\dagger \mu_\alpha) C + 2Y^\dagger C], \quad (29)$$

where γ_C is a constant with units of length.⁸ A similar Lagrangian can be written for (3a) alone. However, $\mathcal{L}_C$

⁸ $\mathcal{L}_C$ is analogous to the Lagrangian density for the generalized spinor Maxwell equations of Sachs and Schwebel, see M. Sachs, *General Relativity and Matter*, Ref. [1], p. 115. The factor γ_C does not affect the field equations themselves, but without it, $\mathcal{L}_C$

is invariant only in the *spin-1/2* case [see Eqs. (28)]. Nor can $\mathcal{L}_C$ be summed with its counterpart for Eq. (3a) to return both Eqs. (3) under variation. Instead, a Lagrangian density for either Eqs. (3b) or (3a), allowing spin-1 transformations of the Maxwell field and current, requires a description of both these equations simultaneously.⁹ For this purpose we also require the Riemannian conjugates of Eqs. (3). These are

$$\partial^\alpha \bar{A}_{\mu\alpha} = \bar{C} \quad (30a)$$

$$\partial^\beta \bar{C}_{\mu\beta} = \bar{Y}. \quad (30b)$$

We now introduce the Lagrangian density

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{L} = \frac{1}{2} [\bar{C}_{\mu\beta} \partial^\beta A - \bar{A}_{\mu\alpha} \partial^\alpha C + 2\bar{A}Y - \bar{C}C \\ + (\partial^\alpha \bar{A}_{\mu\alpha})C - (\partial^\beta \bar{C}_{\mu\beta})A + 2\bar{Y}A - \bar{C}C], \end{aligned} \quad (31)$$

where the terms on the second line are the Riemannian conjugates of those on the first. Varying $\mathcal{L}$ with respect to the dynamic field variables A , C , $\bar{A}$, and $\bar{C}$ yields Eqs. (3) and their counterparts (30). From Eqs. (3), (27), and (30), $\mathcal{L}$ is a scalar function under *both spin-1 and spin-1/2 Lorentz transformations of its field components*.

Adding a Proca mass term $-m^2 \bar{A}A$ to the Lagrangian density (31) gives

$$\mathcal{L} - m^2 \bar{A}A \equiv \mathcal{L}_P \quad (32)$$

and leads to the Proca Maxwell equations

$$\mu^\alpha \partial^\alpha A = C, \quad (33a)$$

$$\mu^\beta \partial_\beta C = Y - m^2 A, \quad (33b)$$

and their Riemannian conjugate. As in the Maxwell case, the Proca Lagrangian density $\mathcal{L}_P$ and its associated equations of motion remain covariant under *both* spin-1 and spin-1/2 transformations (13) and (14) of their field terms. From the four-divergence of (33b), we find, as usual (see Ryder,³ p. 67),

$$\partial_0 \rho + \nabla \cdot \mathbf{J} = m^2 (\partial_0 \Phi + \nabla \cdot \mathbf{A}), \quad (34)$$

and thus for $m \neq 0$ charge is conserved only under the Lorentz condition $\partial_0 \Phi + \nabla \cdot \mathbf{A} = 0$. However, unlike the vector field, where the Lorentz condition $\partial_\beta A^\beta = 0$ is invariant and the continuity equation would thus hold for all inertial observers, $\partial_\beta A^\beta = 0$ is *not* invariant and

consequently there are no circumstances where charge is conserved in all frames for the spin-1/2 Proca field. (This is *not* true for the spin-1/2 Maxwell field, see Eq. (40) below.) We will discuss further consequences of the Lagrangian formalism in a later analysis.

VII. LOSS OF GAUGE INVARIANCE, CHARGE INVARIANCE, AND LORENTZ FOUR-FORCE IN THE SPIN-1/2 CASE

Clearly, within a single frame, $\mathbf{E}$ and $\mathbf{B}$ are invariant under a gauge transformation regardless of the Lorentz transformation properties of the potentials $(\Phi, \mathbf{A})$. This can easily be seen by letting $(\Phi, \mathbf{A}) \rightarrow (\Phi - \partial^0 \Lambda, \mathbf{A} + \nabla \Lambda) \equiv (\Phi_\Lambda, \mathbf{A}_\Lambda)$ in Eqs. (3), after which $\mathbf{E}$ and $\mathbf{B}$ remain unaffected in the usual manner. But in the spin-1/2 case, the loss of invariance of the four-divergence of the potentials $\partial_\beta A^\beta$ rules out an invariant gauge-fixing condition, and as may thus be surmised, problems arise when we apply a spin-1/2 Lorentz transformation to the gauge transformed potentials $(\Phi_\Lambda, \mathbf{A}_\Lambda)$.

In frame K , let $A_\Lambda \equiv A - \partial \Lambda$, with $\partial \equiv \text{col}(\partial_0, -\partial_x, -\partial_y, -\partial_z)$, and let $\mathcal{R}$ stand for any Lorentz group representation transforming A_Λ from K to K' giving

$$A'_\Lambda = \mathcal{R} A_\Lambda = \mathcal{R} A - \mathcal{R}(\partial \Lambda) = A' - \mathcal{R}(\partial \Lambda). \quad (35)$$

The term $\mathcal{R}(\partial \Lambda)$ is a gauge transformation in K' only if there exists a function Λ' such that

$$\partial' \Lambda' = \mathcal{R}(\partial \Lambda). \quad (36)$$

In the vector case, $\mathcal{R} = L$ and (36) is solved for Λ a scalar function. But for $\mathcal{R} = R$, a solution for Λ' exists only if Λ is at most a linear function of the coordinates.¹⁰ Yet even with this restriction, Λ is still a different function in every frame (not a scalar function).

However, if we seek changes in A that leave $\mathcal{E}$ and $\mathcal{B}$ unaltered, then significant freedom remains in the spin-1/2 potentials. Defining $G \equiv \text{col}(\gamma, \mathbf{G})$ and requiring

$$\mu^\alpha \partial^\alpha G \equiv 0, \quad (37)$$

the substitution

$$A \rightarrow A_G \equiv A + G = (\Phi + \gamma, \mathbf{A} + \mathbf{G}) \quad (38)$$

leaves C and thus $\mathcal{E}$ and $\mathcal{B}$ unchanged in all frames for both spinor and vector fields. Note that G satisfies the Lorentz condition $\partial_\beta G^\beta = 0$ in all frames. This is a special *pseudo*-invariant, formed between G and the partial-derivative operator only (see Appendix B). But again,

and its derived conservation laws will be dimensionally incorrect. In the Sachs formalism, the analogous constant (g_M , also with units of length) appears explicitly in equations coupling matter and electrodynamics. See related comments by Sachs.

⁹ The Schwinger Lagrangian for the tensor Maxwell field also returns both the Maxwell and Gauss-Kirchhoff equations (3) (without the gauge-fixing equation). See J. Schwinger *et al.*, *Classical Electrodynamics* (Perseus, Reading, Mass., 1998), Sec. 9.2; J. Schwinger, *Phys. Rev.* **91**, 713 (1953); also Ref. [77], p. 103.

¹⁰ With $RR^* \partial \Lambda'(x') = R[\partial \Lambda(x)]$, we have $\partial \Lambda'[x'(x)] = R^{*-1}[\partial \Lambda(x)]$. Writing out the second equation and cross differentiating the components of $\partial \Lambda'$, then relating the various $R^{*-1}_{\alpha\beta}$ using Eqs. (A7), leads to the condition $\partial_\alpha \partial_\beta \Lambda = 0$, $\alpha, \beta = 0-3$.

(38) is not a gauge transformation and thus does not (generally) leave $\mathbf{E}$ and $\mathbf{B}$ unchanged.

As could be expected, charge-invariance is also lost in the spin-1/2 case. The volume integral of ρ when Y and C transform as four-spinors is

$$q_{1/2} \equiv \int \rho d^3x = \int (Y^0 - \partial^0 C_{\dot{0}}) d^3x, \quad (39)$$

which is clearly not a scalar since $Y^0 - \partial^0 C_{\dot{0}}$ is not the top component of a four-vector. Instead, $q_{1/2}$ has no well-defined transformation property. However, the continuity equation (10a) remains in effect. That is,

$$\partial_{\alpha} J^{\tilde{\alpha}} = 0 \quad \text{for} \quad J^{\tilde{\alpha}} = Y^{\alpha} - \partial^{\alpha} C_{\dot{0}}, \quad (40)$$

and thus $q_{1/2}$ is still *conserved* in each frame, even though it is not invariant.

Covariance of the Lorentz four-force is also lost under spin-1/2 rules. The Lorentz four-force would appear as

$$dp^{\alpha}/d\tau \rightarrow q_{1/2}[\partial^{\alpha}(u_{\beta}A^{\beta}) - dA^{\alpha}/d\tau], \quad (41)$$

where τ is proper time and u_{β} the four-velocity [84]. The left side of (41) transforms as a four-vector while the right side does not transform as any one type of object. Indeed, any attempt to describe a covariant Lorentz force on an hypothetical spin-1/2 charge faces the formidable hurdle that $q_{1/2}$ has an undefined transformation property. This problem, and others in this section, stem from the fact that A^{α} and $J^{\tilde{\alpha}}$ do not transform with the same rule as the coordinates, destroying the usual symmetry between spacetime and the Maxwell variables so important in the spin-1 case. We will discuss an interesting resolution to these problems in our concluding remarks.

VIII. EQUIVALENCE OF THE KLEIN-GORDON MAXWELL AND TWO DIRAC EQUATIONS

Finally, consider Maxwell's equations under the condition that A satisfies the Klein-Gordon equation, as if to describe a massive vector boson [85]. This condition can be introduced by setting $Y = -m^2 A/2$ in the Lagrangian density (31) or setting $Y = 0$ in the Proca Lagrangian (32), the resulting Lagrangian density is the same in either case. Letting $C \equiv -imF$, with m constant, the corresponding equations of motion are [44, 64]

$$\mu^{\alpha} \partial^{\alpha} A = -imF \quad (42a)$$

$$\mu^{\beta} \partial_{\beta} F = -imA, \quad (42b)$$

where $\partial^{\alpha} \partial_{\alpha} A = -m^2 A$. These equations possess the same dual spin-1/2–spin-1 Lorentz transformation property as Eqs. (3) and (33). Equations (42) are equivalent to a single eight-component or two four-component Dirac equations of mass m . With

$$\Omega(x) \equiv \begin{pmatrix} A(x) \\ F(x) \end{pmatrix} \quad \text{and} \quad \lambda^{\alpha} \equiv \begin{pmatrix} \mathbf{0} & \mu^{\alpha} \\ \mu_{\alpha} & \mathbf{0} \end{pmatrix} \quad (43)$$

($\mathbf{0}$ is the 4×4 zero matrix), Eqs. (42) become

$$\lambda^{\alpha} \partial_{\alpha} \Omega(x) = -im\Omega(x), \quad (44)$$

where $\lambda^{\alpha} \lambda^{\beta} + \lambda^{\beta} \lambda^{\alpha} = 2g^{\alpha\beta}$ [86]. Equation (44) may be reduced via

$$W \equiv V U_8, \quad V \equiv \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix}, \quad U_8 \equiv \begin{pmatrix} U & \mathbf{0} \\ \mathbf{0} & U \end{pmatrix} \quad (45)$$

($W^{-1} = W^{\dagger}$, U of Eq. (5), 1 and 0 are the 2×2 unit and zero matrices) [87]. Applying W to (44), with

$$W\Omega(x) \equiv \begin{pmatrix} \psi(x) \\ \eta(x) \end{pmatrix}, \quad (46)$$

and separating into block diagonal parts returns [9]

$$\gamma^{\mu} \partial_{\mu} \psi(x) = -im\psi(x) \quad (47a)$$

$$\gamma^{\mu} \partial_{\mu} \eta(x) = -im\eta(x), \quad (47b)$$

where the γ^{μ} are the Dirac matrices.¹¹ The Klein-Gordon Maxwell (KGM) equations (42) and Dirac equations (47) are thus equivalent and may each describe either two real *vector* fields, corresponding to real and imaginary parts of A , or two *Dirac* fields, represented by ψ and η of (47), all of the same mass.

IX. CONCLUSION

Surprisingly, the Maxwell, Gauss-Kirchhoff, and gauge-fixing equations are indeed covariant under *spin-1/2* Lorentz transformations of the Maxwell variables. Though we have begun its analysis here, much work remains to complete a description of the spin-1/2 case. We might expect that a well-transforming conserved current would be fundamental to this description. But while $J^{\tilde{\alpha}} = (\rho, \mathbf{J})$ is indeed conserved, it has no well-defined transformation rule, transforming with the four-gradient of Γ as part of the four-spinor Y^{α} . Y is composed of the traditional Maxwell input variables, the current and gauge-fixing function (the four-gradient of the latter). But under spin-1/2 rules, we are not at liberty simply choose the Lorentz gauge and equate Y^{α} with $(\rho, \mathbf{J})$ since gauge transformations of the spin-1/2 Maxwell field are not Lorentz invariant. Moreover, charge in the spin-1/2 case also has no well-defined transformation rule. We may still treat the spin-1/2 Maxwell field within each frame as being generated by the conserved charge-density current in that frame, but as this is not a

¹¹ $\gamma^0 = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 1 \\ 1 & 0 \end{pmatrix}$, $\gamma^i = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & \sigma^i \\ -\sigma^i & 0 \end{pmatrix}$, $i = 1, 2, 3$.

covariant treatment the more appropriate interpretation would evidently be that the spin-1/2 Maxwell field has no traditional source in the Maxwell sense and that the input variables Y effectively separate into sources and gauge-fixing functions only in the spin-1 case.

Despite the obvious differences between the spin-1 and spin-1/2 Maxwell fields, their most striking features are their similarities. In their form presented here, they share exactly the same Lagrangian density, exactly the same field equations, adding a Proca mass term leaves the transformation properties of both fields unchanged, they share invariant inner products $\bar{A}A$, $\bar{C}C$, $\bar{Y}Y$, $\bar{A}Y$, and, as these invariants imply, they share the Minkowski metric. This last fact, a consequence of the Minkowski metric's association with the $(1/2, 0) \oplus (1/2, 0)$ and $(0, 1/2) \oplus (0, 1/2)$ representations of the Lorentz group [Eqs. (20) and (21)], is suggestive of a deeper connection between spacetime and the Maxwell equations. Clearly, any coordinate transformation forming invariants with the Minkowski metric leaves invariant the interval $(x^0)^2 - (x^1)^2 - (x^2)^2 - (x^3)^2$. In an effort to find all coordinate and field transformations that leave Maxwell's equations covariant, consider then a transformation of coordinates under four-spinor rules — a complex fermionic spacetime (reminiscent of fermionic coordinates in supersymmetry). In such a space, the four-divergence of the spin-1/2 potentials $\partial_b A^b$ would again be invariant, allowing gauge transformations of the spin-1/2 Maxwell field; the charge-density current would independently transform as a four-spinor J^b , just as it transforms as a four-vector J^β in a four-vector space; the spin-1/2 charge $q_{1/2}$ (39) would thus be invariant too, and consequently the Lorentz four-force (41) would regain covariance. Though we have only begun to explore the spin-1/2 Maxwell field in a four-vector space, the fact that four-spinor coordinates may lead to a covariant spin-1/2 form of electrodynamics, analogous to vector electrodynamics, suggests a broader investigation into a Minkowski-spinor form of spacetime.

Further, the fact that the Maxwell field is covariant under both spin-1 and spin-1/2 transformations suggests that other traditionally-spin-1 quantities may also have fermionic properties, especially since spin-1/2 invariants may involve the Minkowski metric. We might imagine the other gauge vector fields to be candidates for such quantities, however their built-in necessity for gauge interactions appears to preclude their spin-1/2 transformation. But if not these, perhaps generalizations of the dual-transforming Lagrangian density (31) will uncover such fields. The importance of such a search lies in the possibility of a wider fermion-boson field equivalence, beyond the spinor-vector-Maxwell and Dirac-KGM versions discussed above. That is, by describing both vector and spinor fields, the Maxwell equations (3) and Lagrangian density (31) describe a type of unified spinor-vector field. If further such fermion-boson-equivalent fields exist, then supersymmetry may not be the only type of fermion-boson unification consistent with Lorentz

transformations. This type of unification need not conflict with a supersymmetry-extended Standard Model, but it may offer an alternate approach to connecting fermion and boson fields, perhaps one capable of working within the Standard Model framework.¹² A wider search for fields, or compositions of fields, with multiple transformation properties would thus seem warranted.

Finally, the original motivation for this study was not the Maxwell equations themselves, but an exploration of the hypothesis that matter may be understood as an electromagnetic phenomenon. Similar hypotheses have surfaced at various points in physics history with electromagnetic descriptions of the electron mass [88], EM-like descriptions of the Dirac field [89], and recently with analogies between the vacuum and superconducting media in quantum field theory of gauge vector bosons [90]. We note here that with the KGM-2-Dirac equation equivalence, a substantial portion of the matter spectrum may have as its foundation either spin-1 or spin-1/2 EM-like waves. The natural inference, not unlike that drawn from superconductor models of the vacuum, is that a unified description of matter and electromagnetic phenomena may be pursued under the hypothesis that matter waves are essentially a form of light traveling in a diverse electromagnetic-like medium. Further development of this hypothesis will require placing the spin-1/2 Maxwell field in a quantum-mechanical context, a task that remains to be completed.

Acknowledgments

The author would like to express his deepest appreciation to Dr. Jose L. Balduz, Jr. of Mercer University for numerous invaluable discussions on this subject leading to significant improvements in the above presentation. The author would like to further thank the Mercer University library for allowing him generous and long-term use of their materials; the libraries of the Georgia Institute of Technology and the University of Georgia at Athens, and the people and government of the state of Georgia, for providing public access to professional literature in the field of physics through the University System of Georgia Libraries; Drs. R. D. Peters, D. T. Young, M. J. Marone, A. Gsponer, P. Milonni, A. Gersten; the Physics Departments of Mercer and Auburn Universities; the IBM Corporation; Drs. R. S. and M. A. Armour, Sr.; and R. H. and K. K. Armour. The author extends a special acknowledgment to John St. Clair Cline, IV.

¹² Recall the fermion mass problem (see K. S. Babu, hep-ph/9210250; C. D. Froggett, hep-ph/9504323; also J. Bordes *et al.*, *Phys. Rev. D* **65**, 093006 (2002) (hep-ph/0111369) and references therein). Fermion-boson unification within the Standard Model would necessarily give reason for inclusion of the fermion fields.

APPENDIX A: COVARIANCE OF THE MAXWELL EQUATIONS

Inserting the inverses of (12) into (3b) and comparing with (11b) we find [76]

$$\mathcal{R}(\ell)\mu^\sigma\mathcal{S}^{-1}(\ell)\ell^\beta_\sigma = \mu'^\beta = \mu^\beta. \quad (\text{A1})$$

Beginning with the infinitesimal case $\ell^\beta_\alpha = \delta^\beta_\alpha + \Delta\zeta^\beta_\alpha$ we employ the expansions

$$\mathcal{R} = \mathbf{1} + \frac{i}{2}\rho_{\alpha\beta}\Delta\zeta^{\alpha\beta} \quad \text{and} \quad \mathcal{S} = \mathbf{1} + \frac{i}{2}\sigma_{\alpha\beta}\Delta\zeta^{\alpha\beta}, \quad (\text{A2})$$

where the $\Delta\zeta^{jk} = -\epsilon_{jkl}\Delta\varphi^l$ parameterize rotations and the $\Delta\zeta^{0j} = -\Delta\zeta^{j0} = -\Delta\zeta^j$ parameterize boosts, with $\Delta\varphi^l$ the infinitesimal rotation angle and $\Delta\zeta^j$ the infinitesimal boost angle, $j, k, l = 1-3$. From (A1), we may also write $\mu^\alpha\ell^\beta_\alpha = \mathcal{R}^{-1}(\ell)\mu^\beta\mathcal{S}(\ell)$, and inserting $\mathcal{R}^{-1}$ and $\mathcal{S}$ gives

$$\begin{aligned} \mu^\alpha\ell^\beta_\alpha &= (\delta^\beta_\alpha + \Delta\zeta^\beta_\alpha)\mu^\alpha = \mu^\beta + \Delta\zeta^\beta_\alpha\mu^\alpha \\ &= [\mathbf{1} - i\rho_{\gamma\nu}\Delta\zeta^{\gamma\nu}/2]\mu^\beta[\mathbf{1} + i\sigma_{\gamma\nu}\Delta\zeta^{\gamma\nu}/2] \\ &\approx \mu^\beta + i\mu^\beta\sigma_{\gamma\nu}\Delta\zeta^{\gamma\nu}/2 - i\rho_{\gamma\nu}\Delta\zeta^{\gamma\nu}\mu^\beta/2. \end{aligned} \quad (\text{A3})$$

Then, from $\Delta\zeta^{\alpha\beta} = -\Delta\zeta^{\beta\alpha}$ and manipulation of indices,

$$\Delta\zeta^\beta_\alpha\mu^\alpha = \frac{1}{2}\Delta\zeta^{\gamma\nu}(\delta^\beta_\gamma\mu_\nu - \delta^\beta_\nu\mu_\gamma). \quad (\text{A4})$$

Combining (A4) with (A3) yields

$$\mu^\beta\sigma_{\gamma\nu} - \rho_{\gamma\nu}\mu^\beta = i(\delta^\beta_\nu\mu_\gamma - \delta^\beta_\gamma\mu_\nu). \quad (\text{A5})$$

Equations (A5) have two sets of solutions for the generators $\rho_{\gamma\nu}$ and $\sigma_{\gamma\nu}$. The first is

$$\begin{aligned} \rho_{\gamma\nu}^{(1/2)} &= \frac{i}{4}[\mu^\gamma, \mu^\nu] - \frac{i}{2}(\delta^0_\gamma\mu^\nu - \delta^0_\nu\mu^\gamma), \\ \sigma_{\gamma\nu}^{(1/2)} &= \frac{i}{4}[\mu^\gamma, \mu^\nu] + \frac{i}{2}(\delta^0_\gamma\mu^\nu - \delta^0_\nu\mu^\gamma), \end{aligned} \quad (\text{A6})$$

or explicitly $\rho_{00}^{(1/2)} = \sigma_{00}^{(1/2)} = \mathbf{1}$,

$$\begin{aligned} \rho_{0j}^{(1/2)} &= -\rho_{j0}^{(1/2)} = -\sigma_{0j}^{(1/2)} = \sigma_{j0}^{(1/2)} = -\frac{i}{2}\mu^j, \\ \rho_{jk}^{(1/2)} &= \sigma_{jk}^{(1/2)} = -\frac{1}{2}\epsilon_{jkl}\mu^l, \end{aligned} \quad (\text{A7})$$

$j, k, l = 1-3$. The second is

$$\begin{aligned} \rho_{00}^{(1)} &= \sigma_{00}^{(1)} = \mathbf{1}, & \rho_{jk}^{(1)} &= \sigma_{jk}^{(1)} = -\epsilon_{jkl}\mathcal{J}^l, \\ \rho_{0j}^{(1)} &= -\rho_{j0}^{(1)} = -\mathcal{K}^j, & \sigma_{0j}^{(1)} &= -\sigma_{j0}^{(1)} = i\mathcal{J}^j. \end{aligned} \quad (\text{A8})$$

For a finite Lorentz transformation, $\mathcal{R}$ and $\mathcal{S}$ are

$$\mathcal{R}(\rho_{\alpha\beta}) = \exp\left(\frac{i}{2}\rho_{\alpha\beta}\zeta^{\alpha\beta}\right), \quad \mathcal{S}(\sigma_{\alpha\beta}) = \exp\left(\frac{i}{2}\sigma_{\alpha\beta}\zeta^{\alpha\beta}\right). \quad (\text{A9})$$

With the generators (A6), $\mathcal{R}$ and $\mathcal{S}$ become R and S of Eqs. (13), while the generators (A8) return L and M of Eqs. (14). In the standard $(j^{(+)}, j^{(-)})$ notation for representations of the Lorentz group [76], the $\rho_{\gamma\nu}^{(1)}$ generate the $(1/2, 1/2)$ representation and the $\sigma_{\gamma\nu}^{(1)}$ the $(0, 0) \oplus (0, 1)$ representation, while the $\rho_{\gamma\nu}^{(1/2)}$ generate $(1/2, 0) \oplus (1/2, 0)$ and the $\sigma_{\gamma\nu}^{(1/2)}$ its conjugate $(0, 1/2) \oplus (0, 1/2)$.

For spatial rotations, $\mathcal{R} \equiv \mathcal{R}_R = \mathcal{S} \equiv \mathcal{S}_R$ are separately equal and unitary for either transformation (13) or (14). For pure boosts, $\mathcal{R} \equiv \mathcal{R}_B$ and $\mathcal{S} \equiv \mathcal{S}_B$, we find $\mathcal{R}_B = \mathcal{R}_B^\dagger$ and $\mathcal{S}_B = \mathcal{S}_B^\dagger$, again for either transformation (13) or (14) separately. However, the spin-1/2 case yields the additional relationship $\mathcal{S}_B = (\mathcal{R}_B)^{-1}$, and therefore

$$S = (R^\dagger)^{-1} = R^{-1\dagger}. \quad (\text{A10})$$

Noting that the μ^j are traceless, the exponents of R and S in (13) are also traceless and thus $\det R = \exp\{\text{tr}[i(\boldsymbol{\varphi} + i\boldsymbol{\zeta}) \cdot \boldsymbol{\mu}/2]\} = +1 = \det S$, as appropriate for proper Lorentz transformations. Under *improper* transformations, $\mathcal{R}$ and $\mathcal{S}$ have the following forms, partially found by Moses [39], where $()^*$ is the complex-conjugation operator,

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Space inversion:} & \quad x'^\alpha = x_\alpha, \quad \mathcal{R} = \mathcal{S} = g()^* \\ \text{Time inversion:} & \quad x'^\alpha = -x_\alpha, \quad \mathcal{R} = -\mathcal{S} = g()^* \\ \text{Spacetime inversion:} & \quad x'^\alpha = -x^\alpha, \quad \mathcal{R} = -\mathcal{S} = \mathbf{1}. \end{aligned} \quad (\text{A11})$$

APPENDIX B: INDEX NOTATION

We employ separate index notation for four of the five vector-like representations of the Lorentz group $[(0, 0) \oplus (1, 0) \text{ excepted}]$, as listed in Table I, p. 5. In this notation, we maintain the summation convention over both identical and *alphabetically analogous* indices. For example, a term containing indices ν , n , and $\dot{n}$ is summed over $\nu = n = \dot{n} = 0-3 = 0-\dot{3} = \dot{0}-\dot{3}$, or one containing α and $\tilde{\alpha}$ is summed over $\alpha = \tilde{\alpha} = 0-3 = \tilde{0}-\tilde{3}$. Invariant quantities are thus formed by summation over indices of the same type, e.g., $x^\beta x_\beta$, $C^\nu C_\nu$, $A^a A_a$, or $Y^{\dot{a}} C_{\dot{a}}$ (Greek-tilde indices obviously excepted). Summations of the type $x^\alpha A_{\tilde{a}}$, $A_a C^{\dot{a}}$, or in particular $\partial_\beta A^b = C_{\dot{\beta}} = \Gamma$, then generally form *non*-invariant quantities and thus do not “contract out”. (Note the apparent exceptions of $\partial_\beta G^b$ and $\partial_\alpha J^{\tilde{\alpha}}$ in Sec. VII, which are both invariant. However, G^b and $J^{\tilde{\alpha}}$ form vector-like scalars *only* with the partial derivative operator, not under contraction with an arbitrary vector.) Finally, in an equation with mixed indices on separate terms, such as $X^{\tilde{\mu}} = A^m + B^\mu$, alphabetically analogous indices like $\tilde{\mu}$, m , and μ will be understood to take the same values $\tilde{\mu} = m = \mu = \tilde{0}-\tilde{3} = 0-3 = 0-3$. We assume the following correspondence between Latin and Greek indices: $a\alpha$, $b\beta$, $c\chi$, $d\delta$, $e\epsilon$, $f\phi$, $g\gamma$, $h\eta$, $i\iota$, $k\kappa$, $l\lambda$, $m\mu$, $n\nu$, $p\pi$, $r\rho$, $s\sigma$, $t\tau$, $u\nu$, $w\omega$, $x\xi$, $y\psi$, $z\zeta$.

APPENDIX C: SPIN-1/2 AND SPIN-1 MINKOWSKI-BASIS EIGENVECTORS

We present here the Minkowski basis eigenvectors for both spin-1 and spin-1/2 fields (compare Ref. [40]). In the familiar vector case, the spin matrices associated with L and M are $\mathcal{J}_x$, $\mathcal{J}_y$, $\mathcal{J}_z$, and $\mathcal{J} \equiv \hat{x}\mathcal{J}_x + \hat{y}\mathcal{J}_y + \hat{z}\mathcal{J}_z$. $\mathcal{J}_z$ and $\mathcal{J}^2$ have simultaneous spin eigenvalues $s = 0, 1$ and $m_s = -1, 0, +1$, with eigenfunctions ${}^\epsilon X$ satisfying $\mathcal{J}_z {}^\epsilon X = m_s {}^\epsilon X$ and $\mathcal{J}^2 {}^\epsilon X = s(s+1) {}^\epsilon X$ where the left index ϵ numbers the eigenfunctions. Defining raising and lowering operators $\mathcal{J}_\pm \equiv \mathcal{J}_x \pm i\mathcal{J}_y$, the ${}^\epsilon X$ resolve into four orthogonal basis vectors ${}^\epsilon d$, $\epsilon = 0-3$: ${}^0d = \text{col}(1, 0, 0, 0)$, ${}^1d = \text{col}(\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}(0, 1, -i, 0)$, ${}^2d = \text{col}(0, 0, 0, 1)$, and ${}^3d = \text{col}(\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}(0, -1, -i, 0)$. 0d represents $s = m_s = 0$ while ${}^{1,2,3}d$ are $s = 1$ with $m_s = -1, 0, +1$ respectively.

In the analogous spin-1/2 formalism, the spin matrices are $s_x \equiv \mu^1/2$, $s_y \equiv \mu^2/2$, $s_z \equiv \mu^3/2$, and

$$s \equiv \frac{1}{2}(\hat{x}\mu^1 + \hat{y}\mu^2 + \hat{z}\mu^3) = \mu, \quad (C1)$$

where $[s^j, s^k] = i\epsilon_{jkl}s^l$. s_z and s^2 have simultaneous eigenfunctions ${}^\epsilon Z$ satisfying

$$s_z {}^\epsilon Z = m_s {}^\epsilon Z = \pm \frac{1}{2} {}^\epsilon Z \quad \text{and} \quad s^2 {}^\epsilon Z = s(s+1) {}^\epsilon Z = \frac{3}{4} {}^\epsilon Z \quad (C2)$$

so that $s = 1/2$ and $m_s = \pm 1/2$. Defining $s_\pm \equiv s_x \pm is_y = (\mu^1 \pm i\mu^2)/2$, the ${}^\epsilon Z$ resolve into four orthogonal basis spinors ${}^\epsilon b$, $\epsilon = 0-3$, grouping into two pairs, even ${}^0b = ({}^0d + {}^2d)/\sqrt{2} = \downarrow_{\text{even}}$, ${}^2b = {}^3d = \uparrow_{\text{even}}$, and odd ${}^1b = -{}^1d = \downarrow_{\text{odd}}$, ${}^3b = ({}^0d - {}^2d)/\sqrt{2} = \uparrow_{\text{odd}}$ satisfying $\gamma b^\dagger {}^\epsilon b = \delta_{\gamma\epsilon}$, $\sum_{\epsilon=0}^3 {}^\epsilon b_a^* {}^\epsilon b_b = \delta_{ab}$, and ${}^\epsilon b^a {}^\epsilon b_a = 0$ (no sum over ϵ). The ${}^\epsilon d$ and the ${}^\epsilon b$ are related by a real linear transformation, neither are intrinsically spin 1 or spin 1/2.

-
- [1] See, for example, M. Sachs and S. L. Schwebel, *J. Math. Phys.* **3**, no. 5, 843 (1962). Such additional requirements are not necessary in the generalized irreducible Maxwell equations presented by these authors. See also M. Sachs and S. L. Schwebel, *Nuovo Cim. Suppl.* **21**, 197 (1961); M. Sachs, *Nuovo Cimento* **53A**, 561 (1968); *Int. J. Theor. Phys.* **1**, no. 4, 387 (1968); **4**, no. 2, 145 (1971); **4**, no. 6, 453 (1971); **5**, no. 1, 35 (1972); *Found. Phys.* **10**, 921 (1980); *General Relativity and Matter* (Reidel, Dordrecht, 1982). The Sachs-Schwebel equations are also discussed in Refs. [25] and [56].
- [2] W. G. V. Rosser, *An Introduction to the Theory of Relativity* (Butterworths, London, 1964), p. 304ff.
- [3] J. D. Jackson, *Classical Electrodynamics*, 2nd ed. (John Wiley & Sons, New York, 1975), p. 547ff.
- [4] A. Einstein, *Ann. Phys. (Leipzig)* **17**, 891 (1905).
- [5] I. J. R. Aitchison and A. J. G. Hey, *Gauge Theories in Particle Physics* (Adam Hilger Ltd, Bristol, 1982), Ch. 8.
- [6] J. D. Bjorken and S. D. Drell, *Relativistic Quantum Mechanics* (McGraw-Hill, New York, 1964), pp. 23-4 (see prb. 1, ch. 1!); M. E. Peskin and D. V. Schroeder, *An Introduction to Quantum Field Theory* (Perseus, Reading, Mass., 1995), pp. 78-9.
- [7] C. G. Darwin, *Proc. Roy. Soc.* **118a**, 654 (1928). See also J. M. Parra-Serra, *Dirac's theory in real geometric formalism: multivectors versus spinors* (unpublished), available at <http://hermes.ffn.ub.es/~jmparra/>.
- [8] E. Madelung, *Z. Phys.* **54**, 303 (1929).
- [9] K. Ljolje, *Fortschr. Phys.* **36**, no. 1, 9 (1988); *Fizika B* **4**, no. 3, 179 (1995). Ljolje (1988) obtains equations like our Eqs. (47) from a Darwin-like model, but with one of (47a,b) of opposite sign.
- [10] H. Sallhofer, *Z. Naturforsch.* **33a**, 1378 (1978); **34a**, 1145 (1979); **35a**, 995 (1980); **39a**, 1142 (1984); **41a**, 1087 (1986); **41a**, 468 (1986); **41a**, 1335 (1986); **43a**, 1039 (1988); **44a**, 504 (1989); **44a**, 715 (1989); **45a**, 1038 (1990); Refs. [11–13]. See also [15] and [25].
- [11] H. Sallhofer, *Z. Naturforsch.* **45a**, 1361 (1990).
- [12] H. Sallhofer, *ibid.* **46a**, 869 (1991).
- [13] V. Simulik, *ibid.* **49a**, 1074 (1994).
- [14] V. M. Simulik and I. Yu. Krivsky, *Ann. Fond. L. de Broglie* **27**, no. 2, 303 (2002) (hep-th/0201160); **27**, no. 2, 523 (2002); *Adv. Appl. Cliff. Alg.* **8**, no. 1, 69 (1998); **7**, no. 1, 25 (1997); **7**, no. 2, 167 (1997); **6**, no. 2, 249 (1996); V. M. Simulik, *Ukr. Mat. Zh.* **49**, no. 7, 958 (1997) [*Ukr. Math. J.* **49**, no. 7, 1075 (1997)]. (See also A. Gersten, *Ann. Fond. L. de Broglie* **27**, no. 2, 329 (2002).)
- [15] I. Yu. Krivskii and V. M. Simulik, *Teor. Mat. Fiz.* **90**, no. 3, 388 (1992) [*Theor. Math. Phys.* **90**, no. 3, 265 (1992)]; V. M. Simulik, *ibid.* **87**, no. 1, 76 (1991) [*ibid.* **87**, no. 1, 386 (1991)].
- [16] V. M. Simulik and I. Yu. Krivsky, in *Symmetry in Nonlinear Mathematical Physics, Proceedings of the Second International Conference, Kiev, Ukraine, July 7-13, 1997*, edited by M. Shkil, A. Nikitin, V. Boyko (Institute of Mathematics, National Academy of Sciences of Ukraine), Vol. 2, p. 475; Refs. [14] (1998) and [15]. The authors label representations of the Lorentz group with $(j^{(-)}, j^{(+)})$, hence their $(0, 1)$ is our $(1, 0)$.
- [17] G. Papini, *Phys. Lett.* **165B**, 193 (1985); *Mod. Phys. Lett. A* **3**, no. 2, 139 (1988).
- [18] S. Bruce, *Nuovo Cimento* **110B**, no. 1, 115 (1995). See also Ref. [64].
- [19] S. R. Milner, *Philos. Trans. R. Soc. London, Ser. A* **253**, 205 (1961); M. Muraskin, *Int. J. Theor. Phys.* **3**, no. 1, 33 (1970); J. W. Gallop, *Found. Phys.* **4**, no. 3, 185 (1971).
- [20] T. Koga, *Int. J. Theor. Phys.* **13**, no. 6, 377 (1975).
- [21] S. I. Kruglov, *Ann. Fond. L. de Broglie* **26**, no. 4, 725 (2001).
- [22] Equivalence of the eight-component massless Dirac equation and the source-free Maxwell equations: J. Brana and K. Ljolje, *Fizika* **6**, 117 (1974); K. Ljolje, [9]; see also W. I. Fushchych, W. M. Shtelen, S. V. Spichak, *J. Phys. A* **24**, no. 8, 1683 (1991).
- [23] A. A. Campolattaro, *Int. J. Theor. Phys.* **29**, no. 2, 141 (1990); **29**, no. 5, 477 (1990); **19**, no. 2, 99 (1980); **19**, no. 2, 127 (1980). Campolattaro's equations are further

- discussed in [24].
- [24] W. A. Rodrigues, Jr. and J. Vaz, Jr., *Found. Phys.* **28**, no. 5, 789 (1998); J. Vaz, Jr. and W. A. Rodrigues, Jr., *Int. J. Theor. Phys.* **32**, no. 6, 945 (1993); in *Electron Theory and QED*, edited by J. P. Dowling (Plenum Press, New York, 1997), p. 327; W. A. Rodrigues, Jr., math-ph/0212034.
- [25] W. A. Rodrigues, Jr. and E. C. de Oliveira, *Int. J. Theor. Phys.* **29**, no. 4 (1990).
- [26] W. A. Rodrigues, Jr., J. Vaz, Jr., and E. Recami, *Found. Phys.* **23**, no. 3, 469 (1993) (quant-ph/9803028).
- [27] Matrix Maxwell equations in 3×3 form, Refs. [28–34, 58]; 4×4 form, Refs. [35–47, 56]; equivalence of source-free Maxwell and massless Dirac equations, Refs. [9, 15, 22, 34, 43, 47, 51, 57, 58], Papini Ref. [17] (1985), Lomont [41]; one-photon wave equations, Refs. [31–34, 36, 46, 52, 54, 55], T. Inagaki, *Phys. Rev. A* **49**, 2839 (1994); first-rank spinor Maxwell equations with sources, Refs. [1, 48]. For further discussion of these and related matrix forms of Maxwell’s equations see W. I. Fushchich and A. G. Nikitin, *Symmetries of Maxwell’s Equations*, translated by John R. Schulenberger (Kluwer Academic publishers, Dordrecht, 1987) and references therein.
- [28] G. Molière, *Ann. Physik*, Ser. 6F **6**, 146 (1949).
- [29] R. H. Good, Jr., *Phys. Rev.* **105**, 1914 (1957).
- [30] W. J. Archibald, *Can. J. Phys.* **33**, 565 (1955).
- [31] R. Mignani, E. Recami, and M. Baldo, *Lett. Nuovo Cimento* **11**, no. 12, 568 (1974) [see also *Ettore Majorana: Notes on Theoretical Physics*, edited by S. Esposito *et al.* (Kluwer Academic, Dordrecht, 2003)]; E. Recami and M. W. Evans, in *The Enigmatic Photon, Vol. 4: New Directions*, edited by M. W. Evans *et al.* (Kluwer Academic, Dordrecht, 1997), p. 137. See also [46, 53, 56].
- [32] D. H. Kobe, *Found. Phys.* **29**, no. 8, 1203 (1999).
- [33] A. Gersten, *Found. Phys.* **31**, 1211 (2001).
- [34] A. Gersten, *Found. Phys. Lett.* **12**, 291 (1998) (quant-ph/9911049). See also [65].
- [35] G. Rümer, *Z. Phys.* **65**, 244 (1930). See also Refs. [43, 44].
- [36] J. R. Oppenheimer, *Phys. Rev.* **38**, 725 (1931). A. A. Borgardt, *Zh. Eksp. Teor. Fiz.* **34**, 1323 (1958) [*Sov. Phys. JETP* **34**, 913 (1958)] employs a similar eight-component photon wave equation.
- [37] K. Imaeda, *Prog. Theor. Phys.* **5**, 133 (1950).
- [38] T. Ohmura, *ibid.* **16**, 684 (1956); **16**, 685 (1956).
- [39] H. E. Moses, *Nuovo Cim. Suppl.* **VII**, Ser. X, no. 1, 1 (1958).
- [40] H. E. Moses, *Phys. Rev.* **113**, no. 6, 1670 (1959).
- [41] Moses’s Maxwell equations also appear in Refs. [42–46], and in J. S. Lomont, *Phys. Rev.* **111**, no. 6, 1710 (1958); also Refs. [35–38, 56, 64], and A. O. Barut, Ref. [77], p. 98.
- [42] Vachaspati, *Proc. Nat. Inst. Sci. India* **26A**, no. 4, 359 (1959).
- [43] J. S. Dowker and Y. P. Dowker, *Proc. R. Soc. London*, Ser. A **294**, 175 (1966).
- [44] Equations of higher spin in the form (42): J. S. Dowker, *ibid.* **297**, 351 (1967); A. Gersten, *Found. Phys. Lett.* **13**, 185 (2000).
- [45] E. Giannetto, *Lett. Nuovo Cimento* **44**, no. 3, 140 (1985); **44**, no. 3, 145 (1985).
- [46] S. Esposito, *Found. Phys.* **28**, no. 2, 231 (1998); *Found. Phys. Lett.* **12**, no. 6, 533 (1999).
- [47] J. D. Edmonds, Jr., *Lett. Nuovo Cimento* **13**, no. 5, 185 (1975).
- [48] D. Leiter, *Nuovo Cimento* **68B**, no. 1, 53 (1970).
- [49] P. K. Jena, P. C. Naik, and T. Pradhan, *J. Phys. A: Math. Gen.* **13**, 2975 (1980), describe a ten-component Duffin-Kemmer-Petiau form of Maxwell’s equations with a corresponding Lagrangian density and nonzero charge-density current.
- [50] T. L. Chow, *ibid.* **14**, 2173 (1981), presents a minimal six-component matrix formalism for Maxwell’s equations, with sources and a Lagrangian density, but covariance of this formalism is unaddressed.
- [51] Maxwell-like forms of the Weyl equations: Ref. [42]; D. K. Sen, *Nuovo Cim.* **31**, 660 (1964); W. H. Inskeep, *Z. Naturforsch.* **43a**, 695 (1988); T. Ahrens, *Nucl. Phys. B (Proc. Suppl.)* **6**, 124 (1989); S. Bruce, [18]; I. Bialynicki-Birula, [52]; V. V. Dvoeglazov, *Ann. Fond. L. de Broglie* **24**, 111 (1999) (physics/9807013); *Rev. Mex. Fis.* **49** S1, 99 (2003) (math-ph/0102001).
- [52] I. Bialynicki-Birula, *Prog. Opt.* **36**, 245 (1996); *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **80**, no. 24, 5247 (1998).
- [53] E. M. C. Abreu and M. Hott, *Phys. Rev. D* **62** 027702 (2000) (hep-th/9911155).
- [54] J. E. Sipe, *Phys. Rev. A* **52**, 1875 (1995).
- [55] P. D. Drummond, *ibid.* **60**, R3331 (1999).
- [56] V. Dvoeglazov, in *The Enigmatic Photon, Vol. 4: New Directions*, edited by M. W. Evans (Kluwer Academic, Dordrecht, 1997), p. 305 (aps1997jul16.004); *Apeiron* **5**, nos. 1-2, 69 (1998) (physics/9802039).
- [57] H. A. Múnera, “Maxwell equations derived from Dirac-like equations for $j = 1$ bosons,” presented at the International Workshop *Lorentz Group, CPT and Neutrinos*, Zacatecas, Mexico (June, 1999).
- [58] J. F. Geurdes, *Phys. Rev. E* **51**, no. 5, 5151 (1995).
- [59] P. Hillion and S. Quinnez, *Int. J. Theor. Phys.* **25**, no. 7, 727 (1986).
- [60] A. da Silveira, *Z. Naturforsch.* **34a**, 646 (1979).
- [61] Z. Janković, *Z. Angew. Math. Mech.* **67**, T422 (1987).
- [62] C. Daviau, *Ann. Fond. L. de Broglie* **14**, no. 3, 273 (1989); **14**, no. 4, 373 (1989).
- [63] R. S. Armour, Jr., “Spin-1/2 Maxwell Fields,” presented at the 2003 April Meeting of the American Physical Society, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania (April 5-8, 2003); aps1999dec19.001.
- [64] V. V. Dvoeglazov employs equations similar to (42) in *Nuovo Cimento* **112B**, 847 (1997) (hep-th/9609143).
- [65] V. V. Dvoeglazov, *J. Phys. A: Math. Gen.* **33**, 5011 (2000) (quant-ph/9911110).
- [66] A. Gsponer, *Int. J. Theor. Phys.* **41**, 689 (2002) (math-ph/0201053); A. Gsponer and J. P. Hurni, *Found. Phys. Lett.* **14**, no. 1, 77 (2001).
- [67] Traditional second-rank spinor Maxwell equations: W. L. Bade and H. Jehle, *Rev. Mod. Phys.* **25**, no. 3, 714 (1953); O. Laporte and G. E. Uhlenbeck, *Phys. Rev.* **37**, 1380 (1931).
- [68] We distinguish here between instances where Maxwell variables transform with 1/2-angle rules and those where they transform as a varying part of a larger spinor field while retaining their usual spin-1 invariance properties. We refer only to the former as a spin-1/2 Maxwell field. The latter occurs, for example, with the generalized irreducible Maxwell equations of Sachs and Schwebel [1], or Leiter’s Dirac-spinor Maxwell equations [48]. In these cases, the spinor dependence on Maxwell variables necessarily changes from frame to frame, allowing the Maxwell field and current to maintain their usual invariance rela-

tions despite transforming within a governing spinor field. Neither is the Maxwell-Dirac-equivalent field of Campolattaro, Rodrigues, and Vaz [23, 24] a spin-1/2 Maxwell field. In this case the authors describe a nonlinear spinor equation equivalent to Maxwell's equations. But the Maxwell field remains a vector and tensor composition of the spinor field, not itself a spinor field, and thus its standard transformation properties are again unchanged.

- [69] H. A. Lorentz, *Proc. Acad. Sci. Amsterdam* **6**, 809 (1904).
- [70] As described to the author by J. D. Jackson, private communication, the field-potential equations can be traced first to Gauss, and more fully to Kirchhoff [see J. J. Roche in *Physicists Look Back. Studies in the History of Physics*, edited by J. J. Roche (Adam Hilger, Bristol), pp. 144-168; also J. D. Jackson, L. B. Okun, *Rev. Mod. Phys.* **73**, 663 (2001), p. 668], and may thus be appropriately referred to as the *Gauss-Kirchhoff* relations.
- [71] The Riemann-Silberstein vector $\mathbf{C}$ is a natural component of proposed one-photon wave equations [27]. See especially [32-34, 46], and [52].
- [72] P. A. M. Dirac, *Proc. Roy. Soc. A* **133**, 60 (1931); R. W. Kuhne, *Mod. Phys. Lett. A* **12**, 3153 (1997).
- [73] J. D. Jackson, Ref. [3], p. 251-260.
- [74] Connections between Maxwell's equations with magnetic sources and the Dirac equation have been studied by numerous authors. See Refs. [7-9, 14-16, 23, 24, 62].
- [75] With operators conjugate to those of Eqs. (3),

$$\mu^{\alpha*} \partial^\alpha A = D, \quad \mu^{\beta*} \partial_\beta D = Y,$$

where $D = C(-\mathbf{B})$, also represents Eqs. (7) [and (9)].

- [76] Our approach to Lorentz transformations follows that of L. S. Brown, *Quantum Field Theory* (Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 1992), pp. 357-9.
- [77] A. O. Barut, *Electrodynamics and Classical Theory of Fields and Particles* (Dover, New York, 1980), p. 34.
- [78] J. P. Crawford, *Class. Quantum Grav.* **20**, 2945 (2003).
- [79] J. D. Jackson, Ref. [3], pp. 538-9.
- [80] The top vector components in $(0, 0) \oplus (0, 1)$ and $(0, 0) \oplus (1, 0)$ are scalars, hence g is not unique in these two representations, as the 00 metric component could be any scalar function.

- [81] Excepting the 4-scalar representation, these are the only representations of the Lorentz group that form invariants with the Minkowski metric g (or $\bar{g}$), as may be shown by observation of the remaining four-component representations.
- [82] Higher rank versions of four-spinors can similarly be formed as in the two-component case

$$Z'^{a\cdots\dot{c}}_{b\cdots\dot{d}} = R^a_e \cdots R^{\dot{c}}_{\dot{g}} \cdots R_b^f \cdots R_d^h \cdots Z^{e\cdots\dot{g}}_{f\cdots\dot{h}}.$$

- [83] A. Gersten, *Ann. Fond. L. de Broglie* **21**, 67 (1996).
- [84] H. Goldstein, *Classical Mechanics*, 2nd ed. (Addison-Wesley Publishing Company, Inc., Philippines, 1980), p. 305.
- [85] See, for example, Ref. [5], Ch. 9.
- [86] Similar eight-component matrix equations are in [15, 22], and Borgardt [36].
- [87] Brana and Ljolje provide a similar unitary transformation in Ref. [22].
- [88] Recent advances have been made in classical electromagnetic models of the electron, see V. Petkov, physics/0012025, physics/9909019, aps1997jul02.001; J. Frenkel, *Phys. Rev. E* **54**, no. 5, 5859 (1996); R. C. Jennison, *Phys. Lett. A* **141**, no. 8-9, 377 (1989); I. Campos and J. L. Jiménez, *Phys. Rev. D* **33**, no. 2, 607 (1986); D. J. Griffiths and R. E. Owen, *Am. J. Phys.* **51**, 1120 (1983). "Purely electromagnetic particle" solutions to Maxwell's equations, T. Waite, A. O. Barut, and J. R. Zeni, in *Electron Theory and QED*, edited by J. P. Dowling (Plenum Press, New York, 1997), p. 223; also Refs. [17, 24, 26].
- [89] Among the many, Sallhofer describing his electromagnetic model of the Dirac field: "It depicts the hydrogen field as a light wave impinging ... on a point, being reflected by itself at that point ... The incoming and outgoing waves form a standing wave field ... [and the] concentration of energy at the center is what we perceive as the hydrogen atom" [11].
- [90] See, for example, J. M. Carmona, M. D'Elia, A. Di Giacomo, B. Lucini, G. Paffuti *Phys. Rev. D* **64**, 114507 (2001) (hep-lat/0103005); P. Cea, L. Cosmai, *Phys. Rev. D* **52**, 5152 (1995) (hep-lat/9504008); also Ref. [85].